

REMARKS

The applicants have carefully considered the official action dated May 21, 2007. In the official action, claims 1-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicants regard as the invention. The applicants have amended claims 3, 20-25, and 26-28. Claims 1-40 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 12, 21, 29, and 39 are independent. By way of this response, the applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The examiner contends that claim 1 fails to clearly define “a number of loops value” and “a remaining count value.” The examiner states that “[t]he claim fails to clearly define these values.” *Office action dated May 21, 2007*, page 2, §1. However, this is not the law. Applicants may define their inventions using “whatever terms they choose,” and the meanings of those terms can be ascertained from the plain meaning of the terms themselves or from the specification. *MPEP* § 2173.01 and § 2111.01(I) and (IV). Here, the “number of loops value” is clearly defined in the instant application at least at, for example, paragraph [0032]. *See Application*, ¶ [0032] (“The number of loops value L is defined by...”). The “remaining count value” is also clearly defined in the instant application at least at, for example, paragraph [0033]. *See Id.*, ¶ [0033] (“The remaining count value C_R is...”). Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that the “number of loops value” and the “remaining count value” are clearly defined and, thus, claim 1 complies with § 112, second paragraph. The applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112 rejections from independent claim 1 and submit that claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

The applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 12, 21, 29, and 39 also comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112 rejections from claims 12, 21, 29, and 39 and submit that claims 12, 21, 29, and 39 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to refund any overpayment and charge any deficiency in the amount enclosed or any additional fees which may be required during the pendency of this application under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 50-2455.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark C. Zimmerman/

Mark C. Zimmerman
Reg. No. 44,006
Attorney for Applicants
Hanley, Flight & Zimmerman, LLC
(at customer number 34431)
150 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312.580.1020

Dated: **August 21, 2007**